
EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the NARALO Special Purpose Call on Community Feedback on the At-Large Review on Monday, 6th of March, 2017 from 17:00 to 18:00 UTC.

Today on the call we have with us Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Glenn McKnight, Gordon Chillcott, Eduardo Diaz, Leah Symekher, Yubelkys, Joe Catapano, Avri Doria, Ron da Silva, John Laprise, and Javier Rua-Jovet.

We have apologies from Judith Hellerstein.

Staff on the call today we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Evin Erdoğan. And I'll also be managing the call.

I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and with this, I'll turn it back over to you, Glenn. Please begin.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you so much. Welcome, everybody. Hola to all our ALS members from Puerto Rico. This is an interesting opportunity for us. It's getting to the tail end of feedback to this document. We are obligated to have a review. This is our second one. Westlake was the first one, I recall. But the idea of this call is to get community members to comment on what they think of the review, comment if it was on mark, whether it was off the wall, if it was meeting its goals. What I just notice is Alan has just joined and I'd like to welcome Alan.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Alan, we've just started and I'd just like to turn it over to you if you don't mind. You can lead this process through. We can modify the agenda accordingly, but what I just said is we've welcomed our NARALO members to give feedback on the review, whether they liked it, disliked it, and what features in terms of the recommendations. So go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'm not sure how much of an introduction you really want, if we're looking for input from other people because I really don't want to sway it very much. The timing on this whole process is rather tight. We effectively have to have the formal ALAC comment wrapped up in the next day or two because there will be some final work on it in Copenhagen, but it's due within a day or two after we leave Copenhagen. On the other hand, there's also a comment that has been put together I believe jointly by all five RALOs, and some RALOs are doing some independent work on it as well. I know LACRALO is.

There's a number of different efforts and that's good. One of the clear issues in the report is the implication that everything is done by one or two people and we're not really speaking on behalf of other people. So to the extent that we can get other people to either put in their own comments or at least support other comments, that will certainly help.

Glenn, to what extent do you want me to give an overall critique of the report for us before we open it up?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

I can see your point, Alan, not to color the commentary but I think it's worth doing. Try and be as unbiased as possible and just give an [overview] for the sake of people who haven't seen this report or are not really aware of it. So if you don't mind, if that's okay with everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Overall I must admit I was somewhat disappointed. The researchers came to us – the Review Team – with some pretty good credentials and I guess it's an indication of just how complex our environment is that we see some of the results.

The most interesting one, I think – not the most controversial but I think the most interesting – is there are 16 recommendations in the report. At this point, my assessment and the group's assessment is we're probably accepting about 12 of them. That sounds pretty impressive. It's less impressive when you look at the details and see that in most of those cases we're accepting them because, to one extent or another, it's already something we're doing. And the researchers were not generally aware. In one case they used the term "continue" doing something, but in other cases they come up with this new concept as if they have invented something, and it's something that's been essentially business as usual. So that I found rather disturbing and it shows up in other ways as we go through the report.

In terms of analysis, they have correctly analyzed one of the main issues that we have great deal getting people engaged in the work ICANN is doing. We have relatively few people who are actively involved in policy development activities, and that's not particularly surprising. We are the

only community within ICANN that is composed of people whose day jobs typically have nothing to do with the domain industry. That puts our contributors at a very major disadvantage in that if you were going to work on a working group, chances are it's happening during the middle of the day in your day job – or perhaps in the middle of the night which might even be worse – and you have to have a boss who's pretty flexible to allow you to take several hours off on a regular basis, hopefully not conflicting with anything else you're supposed to be doing and just devote it to ICANN. To make it more challenging, the issues that we look at are rather arcane and difficult.

So they have correctly identified that we have significant problems finding people and continuing to keep people who will be very active. Their recommended methodology to address this is something called the "Empowered Membership Model." They have borrowed the term "Empowered" from the "Empowered Community" which was developed as part of ICANN's Accountability measures, although there is nothing relating the two. The empowerment is not the same empowerment. My personal point of view, I think it will just be confusing if that term was being used.

Essentially the Empowered Membership Model is very close to what we normally call "unaffiliated users/unaffiliated members." If the intent is that they're saying we should focus more on unaffiliated members as opposed to ALSes, I think we agree. In NARALO we have had unaffiliated members since the beginning of the RALO but never really concentrated on them. In the last year or so during our outreach and other endeavors, we have concentrated on them and the numbers went up from sitting at five or six for the last eight years are now at 20-

something, and we have gotten a number of people – several of them on this call – who have become very productive people through that process.

So I think that focus is correct. They tie voting to the membership and that is problematic certainly from our point of view for a number of reasons, that if a vote is what gets you to be active I think we have to look carefully at what your motivation is, especially when you look at some RALOs such as APRALO which never votes or effectively never votes.

That's overall where we sit. They have come up with a number of proposals associated with the Empowered Membership Model which some of us find rather disturbing. Specifically, in order to free up travel slots – and that is a key part of their proposal – they have recommended things such as the RALO leaders and ALAC members are one and the same. So the RALO doesn't select two sets of people but they're the same people, and whoever is the RALO Chair and Secretariat also has to be an ALAC member and vice versa. They are saying we don't need liaisons anymore. Liaisons are key people in At-Large who interface between the ALAC and At-Large and other organizations – the GNSO, ccNSO, and SSAC – and they're saying that whoever is selected by the NomCom will de facto become the liaison. And that's somewhat problematic because these people do their job because of the knowledge of both groups they have and can span them. And simply taking people at random and assigning them seems like it's counterproductive.

Those kind of issues sound rather problematic. If we take people on the ALAC right now or RALO leaders – who to a large extent are donating a large amount of their time – and now tell them they’re supposed to do both jobs, I think we’re going to end up with jobs not getting done. That’s a good way to kill off whatever we’re doing if the people who are supposed to be responsible for getting things done simply don’t have the time to do it.

The summary is, we think there’s a lot in the report that we can easily accept. The intent of the Empowered Membership Model that is with an increased focus on individual users, I personally think is a great idea. The details that they include along this are, I guess it’s micromanaging from my point of view and I think they have tried to be too prescriptive about a lot of the details.

Lastly, they also had suggested that the Board members selected by At-Large – remember we just had an election where Leon was selected as the Board member – that we no longer go through that process at all, that people apply to the NomCom, the NomCom picks good people they think would be good Directors, and then we do a random selection presuming that all people are equal and any random selection will do fine. And I find that somewhat problematic that a Director selected by At-Large is selected through a process that doesn’t involve At-Large.

I’m going to stop there.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you so much, Alan. That was a good summary and I think we’re starting to get some questions in the chat and I want to turn back

to one of the ones [that were earlier] by Leah. Leah's with ISOC San Francisco Bay. Leah, did you want to speak up or did you want me to just go ahead and read your question?

LEAH SYMEKHER: I'll just read it out [inaudible]. Great.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Leah is asking a question to you, Alan, about you liked 12 of the 18. Can you elaborate a little bit on – I know you touched on it – but generally speaking, what were the 12 items that yourself and ALAC were pleased with?

ALAN GREENBERG: You'll have to give me a moment to pull it up, but I can do that.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: If you have other questions as well, put your hand up and then we really want you to give comments on the report itself. I know that Olivier's on the call. Thank you, Olivier, for joining us. He's been orchestrating a report from all the RALOs. Him and I have done quite a bit of feedback as well so I prevail upon him to give comments. Silvia also is willing to comment about a recent LACRALO similar meeting like this on where they're coming from as well. So I'd just like to get a sense of where the community is coming from.

Alan, are you okay?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sure. Thank you. If someone on staff or anyone has the URL of the Google Docs with the current version of the document there, it may be worthwhile. This is a document people can comment on or make suggestions.

I'll give you an example of the recommendations. I don't think we want to have me list all 12. Recommendation #1 is, "Members from At-Large should be encouraged to participate in other Internet Governance things – IGF, RIR, meetings, ISOC meetings." And we said, "Yeah, sure." That's the kind of thing we do and we want people to do.

"At-Large should be more judicious in selecting the amount of advice it offers, focusing on quality rather than quantity." And we strongly support that and in fact, we show statistics showing over the last five years the number of responses we have been producing has been going down regularly, and we're now down to answering – last year we did 16 statements and five years ago we did 35. So it's something we have been working on carefully as we go along. So we certainly support it.

Recommendation #4 is, "Support staff should be more involved in drafting policy statements and helping us do the work." Not taking responsibility for setting the content of our statements but helping them draft it. And that's something that indeed we have started doing over the last year. And conditional upon people being available who do that, that's something we plan to ramp up on.

Those are certainly examples. The Google Doc that was pointed to goes into them in great detail.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry, there's some discussion in the chat on the timeline. Can you clarify when we want to have feedback on this document that you're talking about, and second of all, to give feedback on the entire document?

ALAN GREENBERG: This document, if you open it up you see it will be locked tomorrow roughly tomorrow morning. So feedback on this document – this round, the second round of input – we have about 18 hours or so or a little bit more than that to comment on. There will be some revision of it in Copenhagen, but clearly that's going to be limited. We only have a limited number of drafting hours on it. So people who want to influence, it's going to have to be pretty quick. You may want to let Olivier speak and get the timeline for the document the RALOs are working on.

Bottom line is, to comment in this document you have until tomorrow. To comment about the document – and there are Word and pdf versions floating around. People can certainly comment on it other times and send them in by e-mail to me or to anyone else.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. I think there's a follow-up question from Leah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Go ahead, Leah.

LEAH SYMEKHER: I understand that the doc that you're talking about on Google Doc, that will tell the recommendations that have been looked upon as positive and negative ones? Or maybe you can just read them. I don't have to read the details of what the recommendations are. Give me the numbers if you have that. Or can I from the Doc?

ALAN GREENBERG: You'll have to look at the Doc.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are comments, most of them extensive, on all 16 recommendations and all nine of the implementations which are details of the Empowered Membership Model and I'm trying to be as candid as possible.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Okay. That's good because I read the review but I hadn't seen this document to comment. So I will do that. I'm just very concerned about a

working group because as a chapter we just rolled that out and we're not ready to scrap that out. Anyway, that's [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: One of their recommendations is scrap all working groups. And it's quite interesting because in about four of the other recommendations they are saying we should do something and in fact it's something that we currently do through working groups.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yeah. [Inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: At the same time they're saying, "Scrap the working groups," but then they're saying, "Do things that the working groups do." And I'm not quite sure how they envision that happening.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yeah. We've thought about this through really hard because it's the only way we've found to be able to connect with our members and the community at large. So we're not ready to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Working groups are how ICANN makes all of its decisions and comes to closure on things, and it's the method by which you get ideas hashed out and get some common ground. So I don't think we're about to –

again, I think they have misunderstood a lot of what we're doing, and that's unfortunate.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Leah, I'll intercede on this. I remember meeting with the team on numerous times about questions in the survey and I actually supplied a number of questions to Tom and Tim and others because they seemed to be completely oblivious to the whole value of the working groups. And one of the ways the working groups has done besides building community, if you go back to the ATLAS II – and Olivier can talk about this, too – is that the working groups were given a big task to give comments and implementation strategies for the 43 recommendations from the ATLAS II. So I think we've proven our value, but the problem is that it's such a slight of hand comment in the document and, as you say Alan, they just go ahead and say, "Well, yeah but..." We want to have something like a working group but I don't know what [they will] call it, "But we want to get rid of the working groups." It's been a weird document for sure.

Just I want to turn it to Leah. You're complete on your question. Your hand is still up.

Okay, there's lots of other people on the call and I really want to encourage you all to jump in and give your comments on this document and what Alan was saying. Maybe there's parts of the report that you

really like and other parts that you just can't stomach. So I'd like to invite you all to step up and say comments. I hate to single people out but I'll wait for a second for people to put your hands up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Glenn, if I may get in. At this point what we need is we need people to identify... the report can be refined ad infinitum. That work would never end. But because of the tight deadline we really need people to identify places where they disagree. If we're saying something which does not represent the reality that you think we should be talking about, that's a really important issue. Hopefully there's not too many of them but I'm sure there are some.

The other emphasis – and remember I said their Empowered Membership Model to a large extent says, "Let's emphasize individual members." That's something in NARALO that we are doing, and we are certainly hoping that the RALOs that don't have individual members will espouse them and take them on. That was one of the recommendations that of the first review that was now seven years ago or so. But there's an implication in that. The implication in that is, "We are de-emphasizing ALSes. We're not cancelling them. We're not killing them all. But we are de-emphasizing them." And in parallel there's a proposal that will be on the table – hopefully if it gets finished – in Copenhagen that will try to make sure that for ALSes, that we not only deal with the representatives but we reach the members. The power of an ALS is that it has lots of people. But that's not of any use to ICANN if we don't reach out and contact those people. And that's one of the efforts that we're looking at right now. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you. I'll turn to Javier, please.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Can you hear me?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes we can.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Just to make a point. I think Alan is being very balanced and gracious. One thing that sticks out from the ITEMS report that everybody should be aware of if they're not aware of now is this feeling that somehow people in leadership positions are there out of ego or out of a power grab, that it's not based on merit or hard work. That's one of the most objectionable parts of this report. It somehow seeks to restructure At-Large identifying a non-existent problem, which is the idea that At-Large is a province of a few people that are there out of some arbitrary and capricious motive. Again, I always stress that from the short time I've been in this organization, what I've seen is people donating their time and the people that donate the most time are in the positions. And the people that work and opine and intervene become the leaders naturally.

There's a bunch of good things in the ITEMS report. I think the outreach and engagement parts we agree. Some things are being done, things like social media and that type of approach, and strengthening those

approaches. But the bad thing and the worst thing about this report is the prejudice – prejudice in the sense of prejudging something, coming to conclusions with the wrong set of premises. And the main problem in that vein is this idea that somehow At-Large is co-opted by a few people out of some egotistical or egomaniacal motive. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you so much, Javier. I want to leave it open. First of all, Alan, if you have a response and then I'll turn to Leah.

Alan, do you have a response to Javier's comment?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I'm not sure it's a response but a follow-up comment. There were many, many, comments largely attributed to people – either staff or GNSO people – that are quoted in the report that essentially say, "We're just a bunch of five people have been running all of this for years and there's not enough turnover." And yes, we are "clinging to power." The response has all sorts of statistics that shows that's not the case. This may be peoples' impression, but reality doesn't map to that.

On the other hand, there are some people who have been around for a bloody long time. I'm one of them. I'm going to be gone in a year or so, from the ALAC anyway. Have some people stayed too long? Maybe. There's probably some of that. The question is, are they staying long because there's nobody stepping up to replace them or is no one stepping up to replace them because they're still there and it's clear no one wants to challenge them?

You can't prove without a doubt which it is. But the number of people who have stayed past what they are considering reasonable term limits of two two-year terms is very, very, small. So I suspect it's not a real issue but it's hard to tell. If there were more positions open, would people drift into them? The answer is maybe, but it's a real hard thing to tell and you can't say with any surety that would happen. But I think it's really important to understand that we need a mix of newcomers and people who actually know what they're talking about and people with experience.

So if you look again, in the end of the report there are some statistics and graphs of how long people stick along. And from my perspective it looks just the way it should be. There's a lot of people who come and go quickly and then there's a small number that stay longer for varying amounts of time. One of the questions is, if people left earlier would other people step up or would we have a vacuum? And that's one of the key questions. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you, Alan. I'll get to you in one second, Leah. If I can respond to that, too. When I read the document itself I really thought there was a poison pen there singling out individuals. It's like character assassination in some sense. But in terms of NARALO, as you know, there's a lot of new people on this call today and a lot of people that have been around a long time right from 10 years ago. And in some capacities or other they've taken leadership roles. But in the case of NARALO – and I'm saying this for the sake of the two Board members on the call – is that a lot of our elections of having actually a consensus and

we've had situations where we are not [terminal] with Chair or Secretariat so we've had individuals have been Chairs for longer than – according to this report – they should have been. But if they're doing their job and the community appreciates their input and contribution, I think that's the thing that needs to be done.

There is no 360 Review on performance in this document or what people thought of their leadership or people within our NARALO RALO. So it's an interesting document.

I want to turn to Leah. You have another comment or is this another [inaudible]?

LEAH SYMEKHER:

Yeah, sure. This is Leah Symekher with San Francisco Bay area ISOC Chapter. I do see some truth in what has just been discussed. But again, it's the result of everything you have all commented on. Given that we are all volunteers, really getting members to step up and trying to [nudge] them into the leadership roles and involvement is something that we've been trying to do here at this chapter.

It is definitely a big challenge. And I think that's where maybe the researchers writing the report maybe do not understand and see that. I could not have left the leadership role that I have at the chapter until I found people who are willing to step up and had the skills and experience to even lead the Chapter. So I have to stay on as President and Chair of the chapter for an extra year in order to be able to do that. And then to be able to get another small people to be able to support the candidate who would be Chair, to get people who would be able to

support her and even build up support. And we're reaching out to our members, reaching more to the community. But it takes a lot of work. It's going to take a lot of more involvement and support from ISOC and ICANN to help chapters be able to build those things, to be able to have a transition team in place and be able to get funding for them to start getting involved in these activities like the ICANN conference or any other activity or things that they've given up their knowledge, skills, and experience, to take over and then build a team for the future.

Otherwise, the complaint has been there that the same people doing the same thing, but I understand why. And that's my comment. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thanks again, Leah, for an excellent comment. I'd like to turn to Ron da Silva.

I'm not hearing Ron. Ron, go ahead.

RON DA SILVA:

Yes. I was taken off mute. Can you hear me okay?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Yes. I hear you now. Go ahead, Ron.

RON DA SILVA:

I just wanted to come back to the comment about reviews [inaudible] on the Board. The BGC – the Board Governance Committee – is doing,

is forming a regular annual 360 feedback mechanism for all Board members so maybe that's something that'll help, especially if a part of that is included in a way to give feedback to say the At-Large community on their Board member or NomCom for the NomCom appointees or similarly for all the SOACs. I don't know if that linkage is done, but I definitely know that the BGC is working on instituting a regular review process for all the Board members.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you, Ron. I think Alan has a response to that. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not really a response. I'll just note that that's a relatively expensive process that the Board goes through, and it'd be interesting if ICANN volunteered to provide similar resources to do a professional review of the parts of the organization or leaders in the other parts of the organization.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. Okay, Ron. Any other comment? I see your hand's still up. Okay.

I want to turn to other people that are on the call that have been silent. I know Avri's on the call and I know she's quite opinionated on things and I'm just going to point her out. Avri, if you don't mind?

I don't think I hear you, Avri. Avri, do you have audio? I'm seeing her type. Sorry folks. I put you on the spot, Avri. You may not have audio.

While she's typing, Eduardo and Seth and Louis were all long-term NARALO members and as three people who I guess were painted with the same brush that Alan was talking about earlier, does any of you three want to respond to the allegation that it's a musical chairs exercise that we're doing or did you want to do any comment at all in general?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can you hear me?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I hear Eduardo. Go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. I just wanted to say that I have been around. It took me a while to learn the in and outs. But obviously, if I want to participate in face-to-face meetings I have to be in positions that have to be funded –

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry, Eduardo. Can you speak up? People are having a hard time hearing you. Sorry about that.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. I will try a different microphone. The other one stuck and I will find another microphone.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Eduardo is switching mics at the present time. Seth, are you able to jump in with a comment?

We're waiting for Avri when she gets a different audio connection.
Okay.

Go back. Eduardo, did you want to give it another shot?

Okay, we're going to keep this queue moving. Louis. I see you're hand's up. Louis, do you want to quickly respond?

Go ahead.

LOUIS HOULE: Yes, quickly. I've been there since the inception of the NARALO. I just agree with what's been said by Alan and Leah. I think that unfortunately people have been working there and the same people have been working because there was nobody else that was able to contribute for various reasons. Leah was talking about when you're taking care of a chapter like ISOC, ISOC Quebec, you spend a lot of time on one organization you don't necessarily have time for many work groups in ICANN so it's just mathematically impossible for you to participate as much as you would like to in working groups, and some people have been available to work for a long period of time. But I don't think that the organization is captured. You have to notice it's a free contribution.

People are not paid at ALAC to do what they're doing. So the situation's different and I don't think that ITEMS really understood the real process behind the real way we're working at ALAC. I'm really puzzled with that report. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you, Louis. That's an excellent point. I can't disagree with you more. A lack of understanding on volunteers and their contributions on trying to get the voice of the end users spoken amidst other competing forces. Thank you so much.

Okay, I see Eduardo and Avri. I'm not sure if Eduardo has a different mic. Eduardo, can you give it a shot?

Okay, I don't see him He's gone.

Avri, how about you?

AVRI DOARIA:

Sure. Hopefully I can be heard.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Yes, you can.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, great. Yeah, I've had various comments about the draft. I think on the leadership thing they both have a point but they make it badly and inappropriately. I don't think it's a matter of capture. I do think, as

people say, it's a matter of people volunteer and the ones that are doing a lot of the work are the ones that are picked for leadership. I do worry sometimes – and while I haven't done it in NARALO because I've never been a leader in NARALO, I have had to watch it in other areas – that those of us that have been in positions of leadership and often sort of kick the air out of the room for those who might just be thinking about it and when it comes time to run for something or apply for something, that if one of the perennial leaders is standing for it, it does back them off.

I think there's a really good self-discipline and perhaps even a chartered discipline of taking a couple years out of leadership after a heavy leadership role. So the idea of jumping from one leadership role to another and another and another over time has sort of a transitive problem to it and that's the building of [inaudible] they are sort of correct. But I don't believe that one needs to therefore not stay in leadership. I think people should though, take the two years out of leadership then participate in working in groups as a worker bee and [stuff].

So that's one point. So I think there's a balance to be found there between perpetual leadership – and I think capture is the wrong way to refer to it – but I think that there are sometimes [inaudible] effect.

In terms of other comments, I think the [inaudible] of the ALSes is a mistake. I like the idea, as people know, several years ago I tried to get a more vote oriented methodology in for selecting the Board Chair and was shot down miserably and have incredibly negative views of the way it's being done. But that's beside the point. So I think the looking at how

we elect or how having a NomCom and then having it put out candidates or even a slate that is approved by a vote of a wider group I think is important [inaudible]. I was trying to get all the ALSes to vote and not all the members because that's difficult.

I think the link that they made of travel to leadership is backwards. I think that we need to look at the leadership that needs to go, the working groups, the active workers, and the whatever, and have ability, for example, working group Chairs in other environments don't get [inaudible] ones that were going there to do the work with. But I don't think that that's a reason to restructure the organization because of travel slots. I think travel slot strategy has to be more [rational] to the realities of the work that's going on.

I think in terms of the report, they talked to a few people. I do believe they went into it with a mindset. I know most of these people very well. And while the leaders of it were somewhat new to ICANN, the people that were reporting on it were very much people that had participated and did have ideas of and carried a mythology of the worthlessness of ALAC and At-Large, and in fact, sometimes [betrayed] a real misunderstanding of what the outreach to user community was.

I [wasn't] going to speak but being told that I am blunt and opinionated just got me to speak. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Avri, blunt and direct is your redeeming features – of many, many, by the way. Thank you again so much for your succinct comments.

I'm going to turn to Eduardo. He's got a new mic, and then I'm going to turn to Olivier – just to give Olivier the heads up – to give the overview on the comments so far from all the RALOs.

So Eduardo, please.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Now that I'm in the phone. I was saying before that I've been around ICANN for a while now and I have participated in many working groups in ALAC and outside ALAC because that's the way I choose to learn and help within ICANN. But the thing is that I don't know [if we have to] talk about in the ITEMS report they talk about rapporteurs, and when they put the graphics in the last meeting, if you take the rapporteurs, the rapporteurs are the ALSes that we have right now because they're saying that rapporteurs are going to summarize the whatever issues or comments the membership of that region has and they're going to give that summary to the ALAC to do whatever they have to do, and it's not, it's what I almost call the illusions of change but in that respect it's not changing. It's making it worse.

In any case, I have been in ALAC in ICANN for many years and always tried to be funded to go there because I think face-to-face meetings are important but that doesn't mean that the people at that moved different positions – leadership or non-leadership positions – they're there, they're working, and they're providing their volunteer work to do whatever they think is good for the best of everyone. That's my comment. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you so much. I hate to put you on the spot.

Now that time is moving along, Marita, I'll get to you in a second but Olivier, I had you in the queue and if you do have audio, could you just give a summary on what's been happening with the RALO responses?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Glenn. I always have audio. I don't think I'm ever in a meeting without audio.

Thanks on this. Parallel to the work that Alan and the Review Working Group and the ALAC have worked on to respond to this consultation, the RALOs have organized each other and put together a response of their own that the RALOs would be able to submit to the public commenting process independently of the ALAC. It doesn't mean that the responses would be vastly different or that there's diametrically opposed ideas within the RALOs than within the ALAC. The idea is to have two responses so as to show quite explicitly that we don't just have here a statement of the At-Large Advisory Committee that have been accused of basically not going out there and speaking to the At-Large Structures and being integrated with the RALOs, etc. We actually have a wider response from the At-Large community and we show that the RALOs themselves are also able to work together.

It's really to sort of provide answers that are specific to At-Large Structures, to RALOs, and to individual members. So some of the questions that are being answered – some of the recommendations that are being made – do not impact directly on RALOs and therefore the RALOs have refrained from responding on this.

The way that we've done this is to get the RALO Chairs to put together a document that's on a Google Doc – I did provide a link earlier in the chat about this Google Doc – and to then push it over to their At-Large Structures and their individual members in each region and get the input directly from these members. And we have indeed had some response. I know that each RALO has been in charge of pushing this document and sharing it with their members and asking for input. Some RALOs have put together a working group that hasn't yet come back as a whole to comment on this, but they basically have decided to work in a working group to get coordinated responses and then putting them on the document that you should have on your screen if you've clicked on the right link. Others have asked their members to go and comment directly.

So it's structured in the same way as the ALAC document. We've got the recommendations then the responses. It's got a lot of colors at the moment because what we've done is to basically take the answers from a number of key people and just cut and paste and put them there, and the document itself hasn't been refined so far. The cut-off time for input into this document for this first draft – because we did start a little bit later than the ALAC did. We first had to have our own meetings, etc. and then move things forward – the cut-off time for this first draft is tonight in UTC time, so we're speaking about another six or five hours from now, and then we'll put that document into read-only. We'll work on this to start putting these answers together and refining the document to make it a little bit more readable. At present there's just so much input coming from all over the place that it might be a little difficult.

And then once we've got that, we probably will be reopening it for further commenting so as to go through the next level. I believe that the RALOs will be discussing this document when they meet face-to-face in Copenhagen next week, and there is definitely going to be some further input into this document. I really hope that there will be. As you know, EURALO is having its General Assembly. There's also going to be a discussion in EURALO about this face-to-face and further input. And I hope that all of the regions will by that time have brought in their input to this document.

The aim really is to then submit it before the end of the commenting period and have a RALO/ALS/individual members' view on the different points. And I don't think we have time to go through each one of those recommendations but we are, having read these responses, we are pretty much in line with the responses in the other document as well. In fact, there might be even a few further points that are made in this document that are not made in the other, and there is certainly points made in the other document that are not made into this one.

So I just keep on asking – please, you have a few more hours left on this. Read through this and add your points of view and your comments on this. It's interesting to see that we've had a very varied and very widespread input from around the world. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you. Excellent summary from you, Olivier.

I'll turn to Marita in one second. I see that you responded to Eduardo's question. I guess you're reading the chat: "How the RALOs' comments

fit within the ALAC responses as well,’ and I think if I’m correct a lot of it is harmonized. You’re speaking from the same pulpit I take it.

Marita, please.

MARITA MOLL:

Hi. Sorry to be late. I’m very new here having attended my first ICANN meeting in Marrakech last year and spending a little time trying to navigate or figure out how to navigate the various parts of the At-Large and also GNSO. It’s difficult. It’s hard for newcomers. I’ve read this report. It was very interesting but I am not comfortable in actually making a written response in this report because I do not have the history. There’s a lot of history there, I see. What I do see is that there are a lot of people working extremely hard, spending many, many, hours. I found that in the report was a little disrespectful of that. And generally speaking, I guess maybe it’s the way ICANN is organized that ALAC doesn’t seem to get the respect maybe it should. That’s my comment.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you so much, Marita. I don’t know if I cut Olivier off or if he has something else to say, but I’ll turn it back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Glenn. I was just going to add the next steps. Once the RALOs have worked on this and have got a coordinated response and refined response, the idea – and certainly there is going to be buy-in from each one of the RALOs and they’ll use their own ways – but I can

certainly speak for EURALO. I am planning to put this document to a vote in EURALO and see how much support we get directly from our members and from the At-Large Structures. So not only will there be an ALAC response that is subjected to an ALAC vote, but the RALO response would be subjected to – certainly in EURALO to a EURALO vote. In other RALOs what I've heard is that there would be a consensus call in some cases and that effectively shows it's a multilayered system of support and we hope that this will be understood. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you, everybody. We are getting close to the top of the hour. We have five minutes left and I just want to turn back to Alan if we've missed something or an action item that you would like to prompt the NARALO members to get involved. I believe Olivier has really touched on that in terms of the links and requesting people to comment if possibly today and just to let you know, we'll have this as a discussion item at our next March meeting. The time zone is slightly different so it's not going to be your standard 3:00 Eastern Standard Time. It's going to be earlier in the day. But I may follow up on the suggestion, if people are happy with that, to send out a quick poll question. I need to work with Olivier on the type of question that's been crafted with staff and possibly we can get that out this week as well to our constituencies.

Okay. Alan, any other comments?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. There's not a lot more to say. The review which is many pages long and if you haven't read it, you're probably not going to in the next 24 hours, but if you've glanced through it there's a lot of analysis there. A lot of it is correct.

The problem in my mind is the level of micromanaging that they are involved in in trying to set recommendations. And to the extent that you have the time to look either at the RALO document or the ALAC one – and they're big and growing. The ALAC one is 24 pages long now – to the extent you have time to look at any of it and comment on it either saying you think it's a good summary or you think we're missing the mark somewhere, please do. We need all the input. This is not the kind of thing that one person can do no matter how good or knowledgeable or how much history they have and it really has to be a group effort and it already is. The version of the document that is there – certainly the ALAC one – is just posted again last night and having had literally hundreds of comments incorporated into it. So we're getting there. But please, we need your active involvement to the extent you can put it into it in the next week or so. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you. Okay. Any other final comments from anyone else before we wrap up this on time and on schedule?

I'm just looking... anyone in the chat. I apologize those who are on Adigo. You have to interrupt me because I don't see your hand. You can wave your hand but I can't see your hand. So anyone on Adigo?

Okay. Then the chat. Anyone else in Adobe? Okay. Great.

Thank you all and I appreciate your time. If you are traveling to Copenhagen, [inaudible] and just one final comment I'd like to express my condolences to Judith and her family for the loss of her mother who passed away just recently and she will be joining us I believe a little bit later, but I do feel sad for her family and I give her my best wishes.

Thank you again. Bye, everybody.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you all. The meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day. And see you all in Copenhagen.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]